

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 4-6, 8, 9, and 11-23 are pending in the application, with claims 4, 8, 11, 15, 16, 22, and 23 being the independent claims. Claims 1-3, 7, and 10 are sought to be cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. Claims 4, 6, 8, 11-16, 20, 22, and 23 are sought to be amended. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter

On page 7 of the Office Action, claims 4, 5, 8, 9, 11, and 16 were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 4, 8, 11, and 16 have been amended accordingly. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that claims 4, 8, 11, and 16, and claims 5, 6, 13, and 14, which depend from claim 4, claim 9, which depends from claim 8, and claim 12, which depends from claim 11, be passed to allowance.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-3, 6, 7, 10, 12-15, and 17-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,194,968 to Winslow (hereinafter "Winslow"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 1-3, 7, and 10 have been cancelled, rendering the rejection of these claims moot.

Claims 6, 13, and 14 depend from allowable claim 4. Claim 12 depends from allowable claim 11. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 6 and 12-14.

Independent claim 15, as amended, calls for "producing the process compensated DC bias voltage in a process compensation circuit, based on the current [that is generated using a constant current source]."

Winslow describes a temperature and process compensating circuit and controller for an RF power amplifier. However, nothing in Winslow teaches or even suggests producing the process compensated DC bias voltage in a process compensation circuit, based on the current [that is generated using a constant current source], as set forth in Applicant's claim 15, as amended.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 15.

Moreover, claims 17-21, which depend from independent claim 15, also distinguish over Winslow for reasons similar to those set above with respect to independent claim 15, as amended, and further in view of their own respective features.

Independent claim 22, as amended, calls for a process compensation circuit that includes a replica device circuit having a replica transistor that replicates the characteristics of the first transistor and a constant current source coupled to the replica transistor. Nothing in Winslow teaches or even suggests this feature.

Thus, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Applicant's claim 22, as amended.

Independent claim 23, as amended, calls for a biasing circuit including a temperature compensation circuit that includes a temperature proportional current source. Nothing in Winslow teaches or even suggests this feature.

Thus, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Applicant's claim 23, as amended.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

On page 6 of the Office Action, claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,529,080 to Seymour *et al.* (hereinafter "Seymour"). Claim 1 has been cancelled, rendering the § 103 rejection of claim 1 moot.

Other Matters

Applicant presumes, based on the present Office Action, that the requirement for election of species set forth in the Office Action dated September 14, 2005 has been reconsidered and withdrawn by the Examiner.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Bryan S. Wade
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 58,228

Date: 4/28/06

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

501158_2.DOC